

REMARKS

This timely responds the Office Action mailed February 25, 2003. Claims 1-30 are now active in this application, of which claims 1, 6, 24 and 27 are independent. Based on the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 24-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,100,953 issued to Kim, *et al.* ("Kim"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated in MPEP 2136.03, a U.S. patent reference is effect prior art as of its U.S. filing date, and Applicant may be able to overcome 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection by providing he or she is entitled to his or her own 35 U.S.C. §119 priority date, which is earlier than the reference's U.S. filing date.

The 35 U.S.C. §119 priority date of the present application is October 30, 1998, which antedates Kim's U.S. filing date, August 20, 1999. Thus, Kim does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 1-6 and 24-26 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 6-23 and 27-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Kim in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,309,264 issued to Lien, *et al.*

("Lien") and U. S. Patent No. 5,608,556 to Koma ("Koma"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It appears that claims 24-26 have been mistakenly included in this 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection because claims 24-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Kim and no reason for the rejection on these claims have been provided in the Office Action. Clarification is respectfully requested in the next action.

As previously mentioned, the primary reference to Kim does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and thus cannot be used as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Kim was the only reference that was alleged to be related to a color filter having concave recesses.

Lien discloses various cutouts formed in a *common electrode* but fails to teach or suggest a *color filter* having grooves and a pixel electrode having apertures. Koma teaches an orientation control window 33a formed in a common electrode 32 in Fig. 4 or an orientation control window 33b formed in a pixel electrode 33b in Fig. 9, but fails to teach or suggest a *color filter having grooves*, as claimed.

As such, neither Lien nor Koma teaches or suggests a color filter having grooves, each groove formed within a corresponding one of the plurality of pixel regions dividing the corresponding pixel region into a plurality of domains. Thus, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Lien and Koma to arrive at the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 6-23 and 27-30 be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: May 22, 2003

McGuire Woods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/kbs